



United States
Department of
Agriculture



Forest Service
Northern Region

RECORD OF DECISION

FOREST PLAN



#3,000

Clearwater National Forest

Orofino, Idaho
September, 1987

**RECORD OF DECISION
FOR
USDA FOREST SERVICE**

CLEARWATER NATIONAL FOREST

and Palouse Ranger District of the St. Joe National Forest

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN**

**Benewah, Clearwater, Idaho, Latah, Lewis, Nez Perce,
and Shoshone Counties in Idaho**

September 1987

**CLEARWATER NATIONAL FOREST
RECORD OF DECISION
FOREST PLAN
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II MAJOR FEATURES OF THE FOREST	2
III RELATIONSHIP OF THE FOREST TO THE PEOPLE	3
IV A VISION OF THE FUTURE	4
V PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	5
VI THE DECISION	6
VII. RATIONALE FOR THE DECISION	17
A. Response to Issues and Concerns	17
Adequate Timber Supply and Timber Harvest	17
Suitable Lands for Timber Management	19
Uneven-aged vs Even-aged Management	21
Riparian Area Management	22
Timber Economic Efficiency	23
Wilderness Recommendations and Roadless Management Designations	23
Water Quality Standards/Fisheries Management	26
Roads: Amount, Construction, Design and Costs	28
Elk Summer Habitat and Road Management	28
Elk Winter Range	31
Wild and Scenic Rivers	31
Management of the Visual Resource	32
Cultural and Historical Resources	32
Energy Corridor	33
Research Natural Areas (RNA) and Special Areas	33
Threatened and Endangered Species Management	34
Minerals	35
B Compatibility with Goals of Other Public Agencies and Indian Tribes	35
C. Economic Efficiency	36
D Social and Economic Stability	40
E. Environmental Quality	40
F Summary of Reasons for Selecting the Forest Plan	41

VIII	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	41
IX	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED	43
X	COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE AND THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE	44
XI.	IMPLEMENTATION AND MITIGATION	45
XII.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	46
XIII	PLANNING RECORDS	47
XIV.	RIGHT TO APPEAL	47

I. INTRODUCTION

A. What is being decided?

This Record of Decision documents my decision and rationale for selecting an alternative for the land and resource management of the Clearwater National Forest. That Alternative, known as Alternative K, is the best strategy for management of the Forest over the next 10 to 15 years.

The Selected Alternative is contained in the document titled "*Forest Plan*," Clearwater National Forest (September, 1987). It provides direction in the form of goals and objectives, standards, guidelines, monitoring requirements, and probable schedule of management practices. The analysis of alternatives and public comments I considered in this decision can be found in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Forest Plan dated September, 1987.

B. What is the goal of the Forest Plan?

The Forest Plan is part of the long-range resource planning requirement established by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA), an amendment to the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (RPA).

My goal in selecting Alternative K is to provide the greatest total benefit to the public or net public benefit. In determining net public benefit, I considered public comments, other agency goals, environmental quality, as well as the production of resources upon which dollar values can be placed (priced) and resources upon which dollar values cannot be placed (nonpriced). In Section VII of this Record of Decision entitled, "Rationale for the Decision," I discuss how I considered these factors in my decision.

C. What will happen to existing plans of the Clearwater National Forest?

All previous resource management plans will be superseded by the Forest Plan, once it is adopted. Changes from previous plans are subject to existing rights, contracts, leases, and specific authorities for special areas such as Wilderness and National Recreation Trails.

D. What is the duration of the Forest Plan, and can it be changed?

The Forest Plan is a 10 to 15 year Plan. It will normally be revised every 10 years, but by law must be revised every 15 years.

The Forest Plan can be changed at any time by either amendment or revision. Such changes will respond to changing needs and opportunities, Congressional land designations, catastrophic events such as major flood, fire, windstorm, insect epidemic, disease, etc., monitoring results, or major new management or production technology.

In making changes, the Forest Supervisor will follow amendment or revision procedures outlined in the National Forest Management Act and planning regulations (36 CFR Part 219.10 [f] [g]).

E. What is Not Being Decided?

The Forest Plan contains general management direction but does not include projects or

actions on specific sites. Site-specific environmental analysis will be done at the project level. This analysis will follow National Environmental Policy Act procedures.

The Forest Plan does not address day-to-day management. For example, personnel matters, internal organization, and equipment and property management are not included.

The projected production levels presented in the Forest Plan for various resources are maximum resource output levels. As such, they are not decisions in and of themselves. While all outputs in the Forest Plan can be accomplished from a physical, biological, economic, and legal perspective, the Forest Plan does not guarantee that the maximum levels will be accomplished. For example, the projected timber output of 1.733 billion board feet over the next decade is dependent upon several external factors beyond the scope of the Forest Plan. Local demand for raw material, timber imports, National housing starts, home mortgage rates, and Forest Service budgets all influence the timber volume that will be actually sold. Similarly, the Forest Plan's projected elk population is dependent upon diverse factors such as hunting regulations and the severity of winter weather. Anadromous fisheries projections are based on the diverse factors of seasonal stream flows and mitigation of downstream fish migration problems.

In this Record of Decision, I am not making recommendations for those portions of contiguous roadless areas located on adjacent Forests. Recommendations for these areas will be made in the Record of Decision of those National Forests.

II. MAJOR FEATURES OF THE FOREST

The Clearwater National Forest is unique in Idaho, a "jewel" among the National Forests in the "Gem" State. Landscapes and land forms are characterized by rugged, mountainous terrain, high mountainous lakes, clear streams, and vegetative diversity. Nearly a million acres, over half of the Forest, are currently roadless. Another quarter million acres are designated wilderness.

Widespread catastrophic wildfires in the late 1800's and early 1900's swept across the Forest leaving young stands of timber and brush fields that provide the year-round habitat for elk. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game classifies the Clearwater summer range as the best in the State. Deer, bear, and moose are other important game species included in approximately 350 different wildlife species that reside in the Forest.

About 40 percent of the Clearwater National Forest that did not burn is made up of *old-growth timber stands mostly representing the cedar-hemlock-white pine ecosystem*. These areas are extremely high timber producers, and timber harvest over the last thirty years has been concentrated here. In this part of the Forest where some areas were not economical to harvest because of high logging costs or steep slopes, most of the white pine has been killed by insect and disease. Extensive stands of mature and over-mature lodgepole pine and mountain hemlock along with some immature stands are located in roadless areas. Some west coast habitat types which normally occur along the Pacific coast are represented in some of the lower elevation river valleys.

The climate of the Clearwater is dominated by Pacific maritime air masses and prevailing westerly winds. Annual precipitation averages from 30 inches in the lowlands to over 100 inches near the Bitterroot divide. Most of the precipitation occurs in the fall, winter, and spring.

This moisture runs from the mountains in crystal clear rivers and streams that provide about 5,000 miles of significant habitat for fisheries. About 14 percent are capable of supporting steelhead and salmon, which migrate from these headwater areas to the Pacific Ocean and back again by providing a substantial amount of high quality spawning and rearing habitats. Kelly Creek and Cayuse Creek are nationally known trout streams ranking among the top cutthroat trout fishing streams in the Nation.

The Lolo Trail corridor extends across the Bitterroot Range from near Lolo, Montana, to the Weippe Prairie at Weippe, Idaho. Originally a Nez Perce Indian trail that provided access over the mountains to the buffalo hunting grounds in Montana, it served as the main travel route for many years. Captains Lewis and Clark followed it in 1805 and 1806 as did many others. The Clearwater contains the only portion of the Lewis and Clark Trail in the Nation which is undeveloped and remains essentially the same as when Lewis and Clark traveled through the area.

An extensive trail system was developed in the 1930's for fire access. As more roads have been constructed for timber development and we have relied on aircraft to reach fires more quickly, much of the trail system has been replaced by roads or abandoned. About 1,700 miles still exist. These trails are used primarily by outfitters and guides and other back-country recreationists in the pursuit of hunting, fishing, and back-country travel.

To date, about 4,300 miles of road have been constructed in the Forest, primarily for timber harvest.

Developed recreational facilities include 20 campgrounds with a total of 358 camping units, several picnic sites, five interpretive sites, and two small visitor information sites.

III. RELATIONSHIP OF THE FOREST TO THE PEOPLE

These lands cannot be described without including their context with people, those who reside close by or those who have a tie -- be it financial or otherwise. The natural environment and people are not separate entities, but an integral part of life.

From the beginning of recorded history, Indian Tribes used the Forest to provide for physical and spiritual needs. The Indians hunted, fished, and gathered Forest products from the land for sustenance. Many areas have been used for centuries for religious and spiritual ceremonies.

The area was occupied by the Nez Perce Indians. Other tribes such as the Spokane and Coeur d'Alene Tribes to the north, the Flathead on the east, and the Shoshoni to the south ventured into the border regions of the Clearwater. The Nez Perce Tribe frequented the Palouse area along with the Palouse Indians.

The earliest white settlers were attracted to the Forest by the lure of gold and wildlife. Later, logging and manufacturing of wood products became the primary source of income in the local economy. Today the wood products industry still provides the basic income for the local population. The Forest supplies some of the needed timber, but it also provides for spiritual and recreational needs of these same residents. Many people who live further away recreate in the Forest and enjoy back-country recreation, such as, quality hunting and fishing experiences.

The Forest Plan seeks to provide opportunities for the future by combining the peoples' needs with those of future generations. This is accomplished through Forest Plan direction that ensures the best management possible at this time.

IV. A VISION OF THE FUTURE

The Forest Service's vision of the Clearwater National Forest is that of a Forest managed to benefit the public in harmony with nature. Management direction responds to comments received from the public, to the potential effects on people's lives, and to the capability of the land. As Gifford Pinchot, founding father of the Forest Service, noted, "The challenge of the agency is to serve the people -- within that to provide the greatest good for the greatest number in the long run."

The Forest planning process tailors National and Regional direction to provide a combination of opportunities and uses from the diverse variety of Forest resources, both now and in the future. The basic mission of the Forest is caring for the land and serving people. It requires a balanced consideration of all Forest resources in meeting the present and future needs of society, as well as those of future generations. It relies on the application of scientific knowledge, conservation leadership and wise stewardship in partnership with other public agencies, Indian Tribes, and others interested and effected by the Forest programs.

The Clearwater National Forest will continue to present an attractive varied landscape dominated by rugged mountain peaks, high alpine lakes, and clear streams and rivers. Evidence of roads and timber management activities will be apparent in more places than now throughout the Forest, but scenery will be managed to make man's activities as unobtrusive as possible.

In addition to the 259,165 acres of Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness currently existing in the Clearwater National Forest, Congress may designate some additional acres as wilderness. Large areas, in addition to wilderness, will be managed without roads. Other areas which are roadless may be developed during the planning period.

The number of developed recreational sites will increase slightly, and a full range of recreational settings will be provided including areas that provide isolation from the sights and sounds of most human activity. Opportunities to pursue these semiprimitive types of recreation will be reduced in the future as roads are built into undeveloped areas to provide access for timber harvest.

The Forest will work cooperatively with many groups to achieve mutual objectives. The private business sector may be used to operate some Forest facilities under permits, and we envision complimentary programs with local communities and associations to accomplish the objectives of the Plan.

The Forest will continue to provide high quality water and fisheries habitat. In most areas, current high quality water will be maintained. In other areas where past management has adversely affected water quality and fish habitat, improvements in water quality are anticipated.

Even though roads may be built into many areas of currently pristine elk habitat, the capacity to support elk will be increased by managing and enhancing winter range. This will

be carried out with significant cooperation from Idaho Fish and Game and support from private wildlife organizations.

Riparian areas will be managed to provide a great variety of benefits to the resources that are associated with these important streamside zones

When traveling about the Forest, there will be a more discernible difference in management of different areas. In some areas, timber management activities and open local roads will be common. These roads will be designed and managed to support the large hauling equipment associated with intensive harvest operations and to provide public travel. Road surfaces, however, may be rough and irregular. Traffic controls, fewer roads, hiking trails, and obliterations of unused, old roads will be most apparent in areas associated with wildlife emphasis. In many areas, vehicular travel by the public will be prohibited.

A variety of special management areas has been identified for their unique features. They range from small sites and individual stands of trees to candidates for research natural areas. The special areas are usually old-growth stands, historical areas, or other public interest areas. These areas are set aside for observation and research opportunities.

The historic Lolo Trail system (including the Lewis and Clark Trail), and other cultural resources will be protected for future generations to study and enjoy.

The total mission as described here will be accomplished by a commitment to listen to the public and to respond to its needs promptly with courtesy and fairness. Maintenance of public trust means being good neighbors, working cooperatively, inviting the involvement of others, and sharing credit for accomplishment.

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In October 1979, a Notice of Intent to prepare a Forest Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was published in the Federal Register. A letter was mailed to persons who previously indicated an interest in land management planning of the Clearwater National Forest. A brochure was developed and distributed by the three north Idaho Forests about the new planning process. Shortly thereafter, a news release announced the dates for the public workshops.

A total of 210 people attended public workshops in Moscow, Lewiston, Orofino, and Kamiah that November. Participants at the workshops were asked to identify and then rate what they considered to be the issues facing the Clearwater National Forest. As a result of this process, fifteen major topic issues were identified. In addition to these, a number of issue-related questions were determined to be important and unique enough to the Clearwater to list them specifically.

Additional public involvement was initiated in September 1983 to aid in resolving the question of roadless designation. This became an issue because of the Ninth Circuit Court decision in October 1982 concerning roadless areas evaluation (RARE II). This decision resulted in the revision of 36 CFR 219.17 which requires the Forest to evaluate roadless areas in the Forest planning process.

The Draft EIS and Proposed Forest Plan became available to the public in May 1985, for a 120-day review and comment period which ended in September 1985. The Forest conducted open houses during June and July at Orofino, Kamiah, Lewiston, Spokane, Moscow,

Boise, and Missoula. The meetings allowed more than 300 individuals to ask specific questions of resource specialists, planners, and managers and to make statements or comments. By the end of the public review, approximately 3,250 letters, 16 oral statements, and 30 reports had been received.

Forest personnel made numerous contacts with Indian Tribes, Federal agencies, State agencies, local governments, elected officials, educational institutions, business and industry, organizations and clubs, and individuals to clarify issues and obtain a clearer understanding of public concern and positions

The identification of major issues has changed based on all of this input. More detailed information about public involvement and issue development is contained in Chapter I, VI, and Appendix A of the EIS.

VI. THE DECISION

My decision is to approve the implementation of Alternative K to guide the management of the Clearwater National Forest for the next ten to fifteen years. This alternative establishes a basis to resolve the issues identified and, in my opinion, maximizes net public benefit. These benefits are summarized in this decision.

Alternatives were developed to display the array of land management options and to provide analytical data to help you and me make comparisons and to determine the relative effects of various ways of addressing the issues. Each alternative represents a technically feasible option for management of the Forest and considers multiple resource uses in both the short and long term. Each alternative ensures that the minimum management requirements discussed in Appendix B of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are met.

Analysis of public comments on the draft EIS and Proposed Forest Plan provided additional information that caused me to develop Alternative K from Alternative E. I conclude the magnitude of change from the draft EIS Alternative E was within the range of alternatives discussed, and that the environmental effects disclosed are adequate to make an informed decision. See Section VIII of this Record of Decision for a description of the alternatives considered.

The decision on this Forest Plan speaks to the land and its many resources. Underlying these decisions are some basic philosophies. I recognize people as a part of the environment, and want the decision and direction to minimize disruption to people's lives and values. As well, I want to ensure a caring for the land and to provide choices for future generations.

In making this decision, I recognize the limitations of the physical and biological systems. The Clearwater National Forest cannot provide everything each individual or group would like.

Some major aspects of the Decision are:

Timber Supply and Timber Harvest Methods

The average annual allowable sale quantity (ASQ) which can be sold has been raised to 173 million board feet (MMBF) to respond better to the local timber supply situation and potential timber demand increases during this planning period and also in the second

decade. This ASQ exceeds the average amount of timber sold annually (141 MMBF) in the last ten years. The Proposed Forest Plan ASQ was set at 160 MMBF (including 10 MMBF of non-interchangeable volume not displayed in the Proposed Forest Plan ASQ)

90
10
73 ←

Up to 100 MMBF per year of the total ASQ (173) can be harvested from the already roaded portion of the Forest. Included in this part of the ASQ is a 10 MMBF non-interchangeable component of species and size classes that are subject to fluctuating markets. The remaining average of 73 MMBF/per year of timber would have to be harvested from currently roadless lands

The timber sale program quantity includes the ASQ (chargeable volume) and any estimated material (nonchargeable volume) planned for sale.

I intend to increase the ASQ at the end of the 10 year year planning period to the projected second decade timber harvest level. This will be an approximate increase of 39 MMBF/year to a new ASQ level of 212 MMBF/year. This increase will depend on future conditions. If, after 10 years the Forest Plan is not revised and conditions dictate, I intend to allow for this increase.

I recognize that timber sale purchasers need a certain amount of volume under contract to efficiently schedule and conduct their logging activities. The Forest Service, in turn, should be able to adjust the amount of timber offered for sale based on the demands of the market. I intend to conduct an annual evaluation of the planned sales program to determine if changes should be made in the program of work. I am asking the Forest Supervisor to monitor the volume under contract and the volume offered and sold each year. This information will then be evaluated along with other relevant factors to make recommendations on any necessary changes in the timber sales program.

Even-aged management, which includes shelterwood, seed tree, and clearcut silvicultural systems, will predominate. Uneven-aged management will be used where it is biologically feasible and consistent with management objectives. Ultimately, the selection of the silvicultural system will be based on site-specific evaluation of biological and management factors at the project level. Clearcutting will be used only where it is determined to be the optimal method to meet the objectives and requirements of the Forest Plan. Refer to Section VII of this document and to Chapter IV of the EIS and Appendix A in the Forest Plan for further information.

Riparian zones are a separate management area in the Forest to be managed for multiple use but with special consideration for their distinctive values. It is estimated that approximately 5 MMBF of timber will be harvested from these areas annually.

Wilderness Recommendations and Roadless Management

The Clearwater National Forest includes a 259,165 acre portion of the existing Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. An additional 950,311 acres of the Forest are currently inventoried as roadless. Of these inventoried roadless acres, I am recommending 198,200 acres for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System. Another 242,240 acres are designated for management without roads.

A more detailed summary of the disposition of the roadless areas is shown in Table 1. This table also shows the disposition of four roadless areas located partially on other National Forests that are contiguous to the Clearwater. Appendix C of the Clearwater's EIS, as well as

the Forest Plan and EIS documents from those other Forests (the Idaho Panhandle, Lolo, and Nez Perce), contain more detailed discussion of each contiguous roadless area

I have identified two large areas and several smaller areas that I am recommending for wilderness classification. Individual areas recommended for wilderness are listed below:

(1) Mallard-Larkins Roadless Area - Of the 132,746 roadless acres in this area in the Clearwater Forest, 66,700 acres or 50 percent of the area is recommended for wilderness. This is an increase of 3,700 acres from the Proposed Plan. On the Idaho Panhandle I recommended an additional 78,527 acres for wilderness. I am also designating 9,800 acres in the Elizabeth Lakes area to *semiprimitive recreation in a roadless setting*.

(2) Hoodoo Roadless Area - I am recommending 113,000 acres or 76 percent of this roadless area within the Clearwater National Forest for wilderness, while on the Lolo National Forest, I recommended an additional 89,530 acres for wilderness. This represents a net increase of 12,900 acres between the proposed and final Clearwater Forest Plan. A small area (2,960 acres) near the mouth of Cayuse Creek is being designated for fishery habitat and semiprimitive recreation without roads.

(3) Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Additions - A total of 18,500 acres found within the North Fork Spruce-White Sand Creek, and Sneakfoot Meadows Roadless Areas are recommended as additions to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. Another 12,000 acres is being designated for fishery habitat and semiprimitive recreation without roads.

These wilderness recommendations are preliminary administrative recommendations that will receive further review and possible modification by the Chief of the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President of the United States. Final decisions on wilderness designation will be made by the U.S. Congress. Since these recommendations are not final decisions, they are not subject to appeal under 36 CFR 211.18.

In addition to Mallard-Larkins, Hoodoo and Selway-Bitterroot additions, I am designating five other major roadless areas to management without roads. These five areas will be managed by one of three types of management emphasis.

- 1 Management Area A3 - Semiprimitive recreation
- 2 Management Area C1 - Key big-game summer habitat/semiprimitive recreation
- 3 Management Area C6 - Key fishery habitat/semiprimitive recreation

For further information about these management emphasis, see Chapter III of the Forest Plan.

The five areas are.

(1) Moose Mountain - Approximately 16,200 acres or 76 percent of this area is being designated for semiprimitive recreation without roads. There was no change in acreage from the Proposed Plan.

(2) Bighorn Weitas - This large roadless area of 235,510 acres is being designated for two different types of management. These are.

(a) Fourth-of-July drainage - A total of 45,100 acres or 19 percent of this area which was burned-over in the early 1,900's, is being designated for protection and management of key elk summer range along with dispersed recreation (mostly hunting) in a semiprimitive setting. There was no change in acreage from the Proposed Plan.

(b) Cayuse Creek, Toboggan Creek and Monroe Creek Complex - Approximately 24 percent or 56,780 acres of this roadless area is being designated for protection of the fishery and dispersed recreation, such as backpacking, hunting, hiking, and fishing in a semiprimitive setting. This represents an increase of 54 percent from the Proposed Forest Plan.

Approximately 3 percent or 6,500 acres of the Bighorn Weitas Roadless Area will be managed without roads for elk winter habitat.

(3) North Lochsa Slope - This roadless area encompasses the Fish and Hungry Creek drainages and the smaller creeks draining directly into the Lochsa River. Approximately 23 percent or 25,800 acres along the north side of the Lochsa River is being designated for dispersed recreation in a semiprimitive setting. The Fish/Hungry Creeks area of 30,700 acres is being designated for protection of the anadromous fishery and for dispersed recreation in a semiprimitive setting.

Within the areas being managed without roads, an additional 6,000 acres of key elk winter range will also be managed for elk.

The total area being managed without roads represents an increase of 7,500 acres between the Proposed and final Forest Plan, primarily at the head waters of Hungry Creek.

(4) Lochsa Face - Thirty-one percent or 22,500 acres of this 73,027 acre roadless area is being managed for dispersed recreation in a semiprimitive setting. This area was part of a large area along the south side of the Lochsa River that was administratively designated for recreation, scenic, and wildlife management by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1964. This decision was part of a related decision establishing the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, which is contiguous to this area. The Forest Plan provides similar direction.

The Middle Fork/Lochsa Recreation River as established under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 is contained within this roadless area also. It is being managed under that Act as expanded upon under Management Area A7 of the Forest Plan.

About 4 percent of the area will be managed without roads for elk winter habitat.

(5) Rackcliff-Gedney - The Coolwater Ridgetop area of 4,500 acres is designated to provide semiprimitive recreation without roads.

Summary of Roadless Designations

Contiguous to and associated with the 226,340 acres being managed without roads as described above is 15,900 acres of land designated to Management Area C3, wildlife winter range, which will also be managed without roads for a total of 242,240 acres.

The remainder of the inventoried roadless areas already discussed and the remaining Meadow Creek-Upper North Fork, Siwash, Pot Mountain, Weir-Post Office, Section 16,

Eldorado, Rawhide, and Lolo Roadless Areas will be available for timber management. Acres available for development total approximately 509,871 acres.

Table 1. Disposition of the Roadless Resource

Roadless Area Name	Orig RARE II	1983 Re Inventory	Acres Managed without New Roads by Management Area		Recom'd Wilder- ness	Available for Development
			A3	C1, C6		
*MALLARD-LARKINS		132,746	9,800		66,700	56,246
*HOODOO		149,147		2,960	113,000	33,187
*MEADOW CR-UPPER NF	42,100	40,702				40,702
SIWASH	9,100	8,851				8,851
POT MTN	50,500	49,792				49,792
MOOSE MTN	19,800	21,393	16,200			5,193
BIGHORN-WEITAS		235,510		101,880		133,630
N LOCHSA SLOPE	35,900	113,662	25,800	30,700		51,762
WEIR-POST OFFICE	27,200	22,605				22,605
NF SPRUCE-WHITESAND	12,000	33,454		6,000	9,800	17,654
LOCHSA FACE	47,100	73,027	22,500			50,527
SECTION 16	500	0				0
ELDORADO	11,000	7,878				7,878
RAWHIDE	4,4001	4,400				4,400
SNEAKFOOT MDWS	0	22,334		6,000	8,700	7,634
*LOLO	100	100				100
*RACKLIFF-GEDNEY	33,600	34,710	4,500			30,210
GRAND TOTAL CLEARWATER		950,311	78,800	147,540	198,200	**525,771

* The Mallard-Larkins, Hoodoo, Meadow Cr -Upper North Fork, Lolo, and Rackliff-Gedney are areas contiguous to other Forests

** Includes 15,900 acres of land designated to Management Area C3 (wildlife winter range) which is associated with management areas to be managed without roads C1, C6, A3 Therefore, total acres actually available for development is 509,871 instead of 525,771

The Amount of Road Construction and Road Design and Cost

We will build as few roads as possible, but it is estimated we will need to build approximately 69 miles of new road annually during the planning period to meet the projected allowable sale quantity (ASQ) and other Plan objectives. Road design standards and costs have been reduced to the minimum necessary to access the land for intended purposes and to protect against unacceptable adverse impacts to other resources. In addition to new construction, approximately 33 miles of road will need to be reconstructed each year. Road densities are reduced slightly from the Proposed Forest Plan.

Water Quality Standards

Forest Plan water quality standards will meet or exceed State and Federal water quality standards and the intent of Federal laws and regulations. (See Forestwide Management Direction in Chapter II of the Forest Plan and Appendix J for specific direction.) After implementation of these standards, I expect water quality to improve on some areas of the Forest. Fisheries, both anadromous and resident, are the major beneficial use of water in the Forest, and the major reason standards are set at high levels.

Elk Summer Range and Road Management

Forest Plan objectives and standards maintain key elk summer range and specify management of the remaining summer range at varying levels depending on habitat quality and other resource management objectives for each management area. (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Forest Plan for specific direction.) Road closures and other techniques will be used to meet objectives for wildlife habitat and other resource.

Elk Winter Range

The Forest will increase potential elk winter range habitat through commercial timber sales and the use of prescribed fire. The Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Forest goal of providing winter habitat for 19,900 elk will be reached in the second decade after the Plan is implemented.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Final Plan identifies three rivers or streams as being eligible for study for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. They are the North Fork of the Clearwater River, Kelly Creek, and Cayuse Creek. Potential classifications are shown in the following table.

Table 2. Potential classifications for Rivers and Streams

Stream or River Segment	Potential Classification
North Fork of the Clearwater River Dworshak high pool to Forest road #255 bridge	Recreation
Kelly Creek Mouth to Forest road #581 bridge Forest road #581 bridge to source	Recreation Wild
Cayuse Creek Mouth to Silver Creek Jct	Scenic

Until studies can be completed to determine whether these streams are suitable for inclusion in the system, Forest Plan standards and guidelines will protect these streams from adverse affects (See Forestwide Management Direction in Chapter II of the Forest Plan and Appendix M for specific direction.)

Visual Resource Management

Visual quality objectives (VQO's) for maintaining the scenery have been assigned to the entire Forest VQO's are based on the user sensitivity and natural variety of the Forest landscape Standards and guidelines for these objectives have been added to the Plan (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Forest Plan and Appendix G)

Cultural and Historic Resources

The final Forest Plan strengthens management direction to identify and protect the Forest's cultural and historical resources, including sites important to the Indian Tribes

Energy Corridor

An opportunity for a major energy corridor is identified across the Forest from the vicinity of Pierce-Weippe to Lolo Pass Each management area includes standards indicating whether the management area is compatible, conflicting (avoidance areas), or not compatible (exclusion areas) with utility corridor construction and maintenance. (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Forest Plan for more specific information.) No development of this corridor is planned during the life of this plan

Research Natural Areas and Special Areas

Currently there is one designated research natural area (RNA) in the Forest, the Lochsa RNA, located adjacent to the Lochsa River and U S. Highway 12 Representative vegetative and ecosystem types are Douglas-fir/ninebark, Grand fir/Queencup beadrilly, western red-cedar, red alder, Type I and II streams and river. It also contains a major concentration of flowering dogwood, *Cornus nuttallii*, a shrub normally found only along the West Coast. I am recommending nine additional areas totalling 8,355 gross acres (Several areas are located within Wilderness and Wild and Scenic River Corridor Management Areas and will be managed under the more restrictive management)

Several potential candidates and ecosystems are currently being evaluated in accordance

with the direction in the Northern Regional Guide and will be proposed during the Forest Plan implementation phase as displayed in Table 3.

In addition to RNA's, I am designating thirteen areas totalling approximately 524 acres as special areas under Management Area M1. These areas have special features such as fossil beds (Morris Creek), giant trees (western redcedar, western white pine) vegetative and historical values (Musselshell Meadows) (See Chapter III of the Forest Plan for a complete listing of these areas.)

**Table 3. Proposed Candidates for Research Natural Areas
and Special Areas**

*Aquarius (3,900 acres)	Douglas fir/Ninebark Grand fir/Queencup beadlilly Western redcedar/Queencup beadlilly Western redcedar/Ladyfern Western redcedar/Devil's club Red alder Cold springs Rivers
Bald Mountain (370 acres)	Rough fescue Subalpine fir/Pachistima
Bull Run (373 acres)	Douglas fir/Ninebark Grand fir/Queencup beadlilly } over basalt
Chateau Falls (220 acres)	Waterfalls Douglas fir/Ninebark
Dutch Creek (190 acres)	Paper birch
**Four-Bit Creek (330 acres)	Western redcedar/Pachistima Grand fir/Pachistima Western redcedar/Queencup beadlilly
Sneakfoot Meadows (1,870 acres)	Grand fir/Queencup beadlilly Grand fir/Pachistima Grand fir/Beargrass Type I and II streams Fresh marsh-shallow Bog meadows
Steep Lakes (784 acres)	Grand fir/Pachistima Mountain hemlock/Pachistima Grand fir/Beargrass Mountain Hemlock/Beargrass Mountain hemlock/Smooth woodrush Type I and II streams Permanent ponds Average production - potential lake Lakes with fish Lakes without fish Lakes with special fish populations (Golden Trout) Wet meadows
One of the Following	Alpine vegetation
Fenn Mountain Rhodes Peak Grave Peak (318 acres)	
No candidate being studied	Thermal Hot Springs

* Aquarius - Increased proposed size from 900 to 3,900 acres between proposed and final Forest Plan

**Four-Bit- Added between proposed and final Forest Plans

Threatened and Endangered Species

The Forest Plan provides for the management and recovery of the endangered gray wolf. The wolf is dependent upon an adequate prey base, primarily elk and other big game, and is highly sensitive to man's presence. According to Forest Plan direction, over 1,024,200 acres will provide, not only a sufficient prey base, but also adequate security as well. Our formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding management of recovery habitat for the gray wolf has received a favorable opinion.

I am also committed to providing habitat for the bald eagle and grizzly bear if essential habitat is determined to exist in the Clearwater Forest. Studies are currently underway to evaluate grizzly bear habitat.

Minerals

Although this was not a major issue, I thought it was important to highlight in the Record of Decision.

Leasable Minerals - All lands on the Clearwater National Forest are available for mineral leasing unless formally withdrawn.

The consent decision or recommendation for lease applications, permits and licenses will be formulated in compliance with NEPA and processed in a timely manner based on the direction in the Plan, including standards in the Management Area prescriptions.

Oil and Gas: I have identified lands available for leasing, lands available for leasing with No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulations and lands where conditions may lead to recommendations not to lease.

- a. Areas that are available for leasing using the stipulations in the Forest Plan are Management Areas E1 and E3 totalling 515,591 acres.
- b. Areas available for leasing with NSO stipulations are Management Areas A2, A3, A4, A6, A7, C1, C3, C4, C6, C85, M1, M2 and M5 totalling 862,432 acres. In these areas, surface disturbance is incompatible with surface resource values.
- c. Areas where leases are not compatible with long-term goals or are formally withdrawn are Management Areas A5, B1 and B2, totaling 459,117.

Locatable Minerals - All lands on the Clearwater National Forest are available for entry unless formally withdrawn. About 1,567,907 acres on the Forest are open to mineral entry. Significant surface disturbing activities on mining claims, mill sites and tunnel site locations will require a Notice of Intent and/or a Plan of Operations under 36 CFR 228 to assure orderly development of the mineral resource and protection of surface resources. Decisions on submittals for development will be formulated in compliance with NEPA and processed in a timely manner based on direction in the Plan, including standards identified in Management Area Prescriptions. About 269,209 acres of wilderness areas, campgrounds and administrative sites are withdrawn from mineral entry.

Common Variety Minerals - Lands on the Clearwater National Forest are available for development of common variety resources. Decisions on proposals for development will be formulated in compliance with NEPA and processed in a timely manner based on direction.

in the Plan, including standards identified in Management Area prescriptions. About 654,262 acres are withdrawn or development is not permitted by direction in the Forest Plan

VII. RATIONALE FOR THE DECISION

The factors I have used to determine which alternative maximizes net public benefit include response to issues, concerns, and opportunities, environmental quality, economic efficiency; and compatibility with goals of other agencies and Indian Tribes. In making this decision, I recognize the limitations of physical and biological systems, and that the Clearwater National Forest cannot provide everything each individual or group would like

Of critical importance is the minimization of disruptions to people's lives and values. By this, I mean to contribute to a predictable, orderly and manageable rate of change in the local communities. Any significant short-run changes caused by this decision would be viewed as undesirable. This knowledge allows community leaders, businesses, and people sufficient time to react to those changes

While the Forest Plan is a decision which shapes and affects communities and people, other factors are also at work. Variables include National supply and demand, changes in preferences, and social changes within communities close to home as well as Nationally and world-wide.

A. Response to issues, concerns and opportunities

One of the major reasons I chose to implement Alternative K is because it responds positively and thoroughly to public issues and management concerns. Since many issues and concerns conflict, it is not possible to resolve them all. Following is my evaluation of the Selected Alternative's response to each issue

Adequate Timber Supply and Timber Harvest

The timber issue is one of the more controversial because of its relationship to all other Forest resources and uses. People have conflicting views on timber harvest. Some view it as being compatible with other uses of the Forest and see it as being in the public interest. Others believe it is generally detrimental to other uses of the Forest and believe that timber harvest should be few in number or even eliminated altogether.

I recognize the desire of the timber industry and local community leaders to have more timber offered for sale in the next 10 to 15 years. I have studied the data presented in *A Report on Idaho Timber Supply* and understand that the supply of timber from industrial and private lands will decrease in the coming decade from harvest levels of the previous decade. I also understand the significance of the National Forest timber supply to the needs of timber industry when evaluated from a Regional and State-wide perspective (*A Report on Idaho Timber Supply*, USDA Forest Service, February 1987).

On the other hand, considerable public input said that existing timber supply was adequate and even if it wasn't, the Clearwater National Forest should not accept the responsibility of trying to make up the difference in supply. Proponents of this opinion were concerned that increasing timber harvest would have adverse effects on other resources and would require building roads in undeveloped lands.

I recognize the concerns of the environmental community that timber harvest has the

potential to affect other resources adversely and that an over emphasis on it could reduce other resource values. The degree to which other resources could be affected by timber harvesting has been carefully analyzed (See Chapter IV, Section V, W, and BB in the EIS.)

I have analyzed this information along with the ability of the Forest to produce timber and at the same time meet laws, regulations, and the Forest Plan's goals, objectives, and standards for all resources. I have come to the following conclusions:

- I believe demand for sawtimber will be increasing because of increasing population and housing needs as well as the Canadian softwood import situation. In the last year, I have already seen evidence of this occurring through the reconstruction of the Potlatch-Lewiston sawmill and plywood plant, the planned new waferboard mill at the Port of Lewiston; and the reopening of the Kamiah Triple R Mill. If there will be a shortage of timber supply, it is most likely to occur between the years 1995 and 2010 according to the timber supply study cited previously. (See Appendix B, Section VIII, D, and Chapter II of the EIS for more specific information.)

- More timber (173 MMBF) can be offered during this planning period than the Proposed Plan allowable sale quantity (ASQ) of 160 MMBF and still meet laws, regulations, and Forest Plan goals, objectives, and standards. However, only approximately 100 MMBF can be harvested from areas of the Forest which now have roads to meet Regional Guide and Forest Plan objectives for wildlife habitat, diversity of age classes, size of openings, and old growth. (See Forestwide Management Direction in Chapter II of the Forest Plan.) By limiting the harvest level in these areas, I will insure essentially the same timber supply from these lands in the second planning period when timber is more likely to be in short supply. (See Chapter II and Appendix B of the EIS.)

- Approximately 73 MMBF/year during the planning period is scheduled from sale areas located within inventoried roadless areas. In the event these areas are made unavailable for timber sales due to appeals and litigation or lack of funds, the sale program will be reduced accordingly.

- During the review of the Forest Plan, it was brought out that part of the wood products available for harvest in the Forest were not being included in calculation of the ASQ. Included in this category are dead or live trees that are currently not marketable. The amount of this material sold has fluctuated with market conditions. I have decided to include this category of timber as a non-interchangeable component of the 173 MMBF ASQ; it may not be interchanged or substituted with the regular, green sawlog component. A total of 100 MMBF may be harvested from this component during the planning period (1988-1997) or approximately 10 MMBF annually.

- Other landowners in this area, especially the State of Idaho lands, also have opportunities to increase timber available from their lands to offset potential supply shortages in the future. (A Report on Idaho Timber Supply, USDA Forest Service, February 1987)

I have evaluated those alternatives that offered timber sale quantities in excess of the past 10-year average. Even with measures to mitigate negative impacts, the magnitude of the harvest increases in many of these alternatives has the potential to adversely affect the environment. I have also evaluated alternatives that offered less timber than has been offered in the past. I believe that these alternatives do not provide an adequate amount of timber to support this important segment of the local economy.

Given the available timber supply and environmental considerations in Alternative K, I believe it maximizes net public benefit. While the average annual ASQ will be 173 MMBF annually during the planning period (1988-1997), the amount of timber actually offered for sale each year may vary depending on the demand for timber, money available to prepare the sales, and the ability to develop roadless areas for timber harvests.

Suitable Lands for Timber Management

Some respondents thought that more of the Clearwater should be considered unsuitable for timber to meet the land management planning regulations. Specifically, these respondents said more land should be considered unsuitable for timber to meet the requirements of reforesting harvested areas within five years because of potential irreversible soil and water affects, and because of economic considerations. Other respondents were concerned that only 54 percent of the Forest was considered suitable for timber management in the Proposed Plan.

I have decided to designate 987,971 acres or 54 percent of the Forest as suitable for timber management.

Table 4 shows the results of the suitable land determination for timber management for the Clearwater National Forest. Under the suitable category, the total acres were separated into two categories. The analysis indicates there are 840,000 acres of tentatively suitable lands in the Clearwater National Forest where direct benefits exceed direct costs including the associated road costs. The ASQ from these lands averages 131 MMBF per year for the life of the Forest Plan. On the remaining 148,000 acres direct timber benefits are less than direct timber costs. These areas are assigned to the suitable timber base to provide local jobs and income and to meet multiple use objectives, such as, visual and winter range improvement, to provide for plant diversity and to manage insects and disease in the Forest. The ASQ from these lands is 42 MMBF.

Under the tentatively not recommended suitable category, approximately 138,000 acres of tentatively suitable land are for wilderness classification. And approximately 203,000 acres of tentatively suitable land are designated to be managed to provide key big-game summer range, key fishery habitat and settings for semiprimitive recreation. Also 7,063 acres have also been proposed for designation as research natural or special areas.

TABLE 4
TIMBER RESOURCE LAND SUITABILITY
CLEARWATER NATIONAL FORESTS

NOT SUITED		ACRES			
Not Capable & Non Forest		172,151	Note * Volume figures include ~ Chargeable Volume Only ~ Non-Interchangeable components to meet management objectives		
Irreversible Soil and Watershed Damage		0			
No Assurance of Adequate Restocking		51,997			
Withdrawn from Timber Production		276,894			
Subtotal of Above		501,042			
SUITABLE			EFFECTS		
* LANDS COST EFFICIENT			1st Decade		LTSY
			Acres	MMBF	MMBF
	Direct Benefits Exceed Direct Costs	840,380	8,672	131	-
	Direct Costs Exceed Direct Benefits				
	Meet Non Timber M.U. Objective	147,591	2,521	42	-
	Local Jobs/Income	Included in the line above			
	Subtotal of Above	987,971	11,193	173	440
TENTATIVELY NOT SUITED			RESOURCE OPPORTUNITY		
			1st Decade		LTSY
			Acres	MMBF	MMBF
	Lands Not Cost Efficient to Meet Objectives- Future Timber Production Possible	0	0	0	
	Multiple-Use Objectives Preclude Timber Production				
	Other Uses	209,878	-	-	-
	Proposed Wilderness	138,225	-	-	-
Subtotal of Above		348,103	0	0	
TOTAL NATIONAL FOREST LANDS		1,837,116			

Effective Period from 1987 thru 1996

I have been able to maintain essentially the same level of suitable acres as in the Proposed Forest Plan even though I have increased designations for recommended wilderness and roadless areas in the final Plan. I have done this by including some less economically efficient lands in the suitable base to retain flexibility in management as described previously. No acres were designated unsuitable because of irreversible soil or watershed damage, but as mentioned earlier several areas (Management Area C6, 102,440 acres) will be designated to remain undeveloped to protect key fisheries.

In addition, we have recognized land types that may present special problems and have developed Forestwide standards to address these problems. (See Soil Standards in Chapter II of the Forest Plan.) Areas of steep slopes have been designated to Management Area E3 which requires minimal road building and application of aerial harvest methods to mitigate potential mass wasting and erosion.

Public comments also recommended that we map unsuitable lands to comply with the National Forest Management Act, and I have done that to the extent feasible on the Forest Plan map. However, this mapping is subject to monitoring and change during Forest Plan implementation.

Uneven-aged vs. Even-aged Management

There are two basic ways to manage timber stands in the Clearwater National Forest, even-aged and uneven-aged. This was the subject of considerable public comments.

In determining which of these is the appropriate silvicultural systems, I considered three groups of factors.

The first group considered was the major vegetative types found in the Forest and the condition of the individual stands. The four major vegetative types are mixed conifer, ponderosa pine-rocky mountain Douglas fir, Engelmann spruce-subalpine fir, and lodgepole pine. State-of-the-art silvicultural information indicates that either even-aged or uneven-aged management can be used on any of these vegetative types; however, the condition of individual stands is critical to the decision. (*Silvicultural Systems for Major Forest Types of the United States*, Agricultural Handbook 455, USDA Forest Service.) Stands with decadent overstory vegetation and sparse regeneration, and stands at high risk to insect disease epidemics are common. With even-aged systems, stands with a high percentage of over-mature, suppressed, or diseased trees can be rapidly regenerated into young, vigorous stands. There is also more opportunity to control species and stocking to minimize future pest problems.

The second group of factors I considered were the objectives for resources other than timber and the ways they are affected by silvicultural systems. Included were the amount of disturbance to wildlife due to logging and related activities, the economic efficiency of timber harvesting and the road system, the impact on scenery, the ability to meet the needs of resources dependent on riparian areas, and the growth rate of regenerated trees.

Even-aged management maximizes the volume of timber per unit of road and enhances the economics of harvesting. Even-aged management, even though it has a more immediate impact on wildlife than uneven-aged management, usually requires logging only one to three times during an 80 to 120 year rotation, thus reducing the overall long-term impact.

I did consider uneven-aged management for those areas where other resource objectives

like scenic quality can be met by stand conditions and harvest operations resulting from selection cutting. Uneven-aged management generally provides continuous tree cover, resulting in less apparent visual changes and provides hiding cover for some wildlife species; however, it also requires frequent logging over a larger land area to harvest the same volume of timber. It is my opinion that minimizing disturbance to wildlife is more important than continuous tree cover in most instances, but that continuous tree cover is desirable in certain areas to maintain good scenery. Uneven-aged management may be used in both visually sensitive areas and in riparian areas depending on the silvicultural prescriptions on specific sites

The third group of factors I considered were the standards for silvicultural systems established in the Northern Region Guide. This includes the ability to create stand conditions required to meet other resource objectives in the Forest Plan and the ability to regenerate the site promptly and maintain adequate production. It also includes considering stand conditions that minimize risk of damage from pests, animals, and fire, and the choice of a system that is compatible with current technology and logging systems.

I have decided that, in general, even-aged management is the appropriate silvicultural system to use in the Clearwater National Forest. However, since a wide variety of unique site-specific conditions exists in the Forest, all vegetative management practices by timber sales or nontimber sale activities will be preceded by a silvicultural examination, a specific analysis of the area, and a site-specific prescription. These prescriptions will detail the actual silvicultural system to be implemented on a case-by-case basis.

Clearcutting and shelterwood are the primary harvest methods used for regeneration harvests in even-aged management. Under certain physical and biological conditions, clearcutting is the optimum harvest method when considering other multiple resource objectives. The conditions under which tree regeneration clearcutting will be considered are: favorable moisture and temperature on the cleared site for tree regeneration; disease and/or insect conditions in the existing stand that can best be treated by complete removal, and overall resource objectives for the stand (wildlife habitat, visuals, etc.). I estimate that clearcutting will be the optimum harvest system on approximately 70 percent of the acres harvested under even-aged systems.

The final decision on which harvest method will be used will be based on a site-specific silvicultural prescription and interdisciplinary review. Additional discussion on the impacts of even-aged and uneven-aged silvicultural systems and an evaluation of each can be found in Chapter II and Chapter IV of the EIS and in Appendix A of the Forest Plan.

Riparian Area Management

Respondents to the Proposed Forest Plan objected to our proposed riparian management and pointed out that it appeared we were managing riparian areas for intensive timber production. Other respondents expressed concerns that we weren't planning enough timber harvest from these areas since they have high potential for timber production.

I recognize that riparian areas are extremely important to many Forest resources, especially water quality and quantity, fish habitat, wildlife habitat, and recreation. Riparian areas maintain stream channel structure, help control flooding, influence water temperature, prevent sediment from reaching streams and are inhabited by different species of plants and animals, therefore providing diversity. For these reasons they are afforded extra protection by laws, regulations, and the Forest Plan. (See Forest Plan, Chapter III, Management Area M2.)

Timber harvest will occur in riparian areas but will be modified to protect the area and its resources. A combination of silvicultural systems may be used to harvest timber and maintain or enhance riparian values. Harvest will usually occur along with adjacent upslope lands. It is projected about 5 MMBF will be offered for sale annually from these areas, but the actual amount and silvicultural systems used will depend on site specific analysis

Except in rare circumstances, roads will not be built parallel with streams in riparian zones. Road crossings of riparian zones will occur as needed, but with proper design to insure that adverse effects are minimized.

Timber Economic Efficiency

The economic efficiency of timber production has been well analyzed. What is apparent is that much of the timber is "near the margin." This means that a slight change in either cost or values can change the economic production level for the Forest. In my opinion, the ASQ of 173 MMBF annually determined by the Plan is economically acceptable. I realize in establishing this level of ASQ we may incur "below cost sales," but, in my judgement, these sales are needed to meet other resource objectives and employment and revenue opportunities to local, dependent communities.

Wilderness Recommendations and Roadless Management Designations

This issue, along with timber supply, generated more response from the public than all other issues combined. For example, many who wanted more wilderness and/or roadless management, also wanted less timber harvest and vice versa. Although there were numerous responses desiring more wilderness or roadless area for the pure sake of wilderness/roadless and recreation, many other respondents wanted no development because they were concerned about the adverse effect of development on other resources such as fish, wildlife, water quality, and scenery. Many also wanted little or no additional wilderness because they were concerned that wilderness designation precludes timber harvest and motorized recreation, and/or because they thought that there was already enough wilderness.

The increase of 9,300 acres of recommended wilderness and 53,840 acres of management without roads between the proposed and final Plans is primarily in response to public concerns for individual areas for the above issues.

Reasons and background for my decision are presented below for each major roadless area.

(1) Mallard-Larkins - Public interest and concern for the wildland characteristics of this area date back to the 1960's. A 32,000 acre pioneer area was established by the Regional Forester in 1969 in response to local public interest. Concerns have been expressed by the timber industry and others that wilderness recommendations that included any land with timber potential was not acceptable. Other respondents support a much larger area for wilderness designation including some of the river breaks on the North Fork of the Clearwater River.

I am recommending 66,700 acres be designated for wilderness. An area very similar in size were recommended for wilderness in RARE I and RARE II in the 1970's.

-- The area I am recommending for wilderness includes all of the high peaks and mountain lakes on the main divide between the Clearwater and St Joe Rivers. The 9,800-acre Elizabeth Lakes area is predominantly covered with timber but is located on very sensitive soil and extremely steep lands, and the timber has low production potential. It is designated to be managed without roads for semiprimitive recreation.

The remaining 43 percent of the roadless area includes the lower elevation and other productive timber lands and is needed and designated suitable for timber management. It is estimated that approximately 18 percent of the area available for timber will need to be developed in the first decade to meet the projected ASQ.

(2) Hoodoo - This area known also as "The Great Burn" has, like the Mallard-Larkins, been in the limelight since the 1960's. An area of approximately 190,000 acres, it was included in the RARE I and RARE II recommendations for wilderness. Interest and support for a classified wilderness has extended from the local level to the National level in several environmental circles. The same concerns expressed about Mallard-Larkins have been expressed about this area by the timber industry and others that too much of the productive timberland is being included in the wilderness recommendations.

Nearly all of the Clearwater National Forest portion of this area was burned over in the early 1900's and much of it above 5,000 feet remains in brush and other low vegetation. Other more productive sites have regenerated to varying degrees, predominately in lodgepole pine. I am including the lodgepole pine covered slopes along the south side of Kelly Creek in my wilderness recommendation because they are an integral part of the overall wilderness values of the larger area. In a change from the proposed Forest Plan, I have moved the boundary close to the mouth of Moose Creek at the old Kelly Creek Work Center. This change will include the entire Kelly Creek drainage. I think this is the most logical area to manage for wilderness values.

Management of the drainages to the north in the vicinity of Pollock and Laundry Ridge will include timber management. Of the 33,187 acres available for development, an estimated 12 percent will need to be developed in the first decade to meet the projected ASQ.

(3) Selway-Bitterroot Additions - Because of earlier Forest planning efforts called unit planning, the Elk Summit area, which includes several inventoried roadless areas, was not included in RARE II. These areas have been a source of public interest and controversy since before 1964, when the Wilderness Act was passed, and this area was excluded from the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. Proponents of wilderness claim that wilderness designation is the only way to guarantee the maintenance of high quality fisheries. Other respondents are concerned that the potential timber of the area would be lost in a wilderness designation.

I am recommending that several key areas totalling 18,500 acres contiguous to the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness be added to that Wilderness because they are logical additions and have high wilderness values. I am also designating an additional 12,000 acres to management without roads for the protection of water quality and anadromous fisheries, and I am proposing a 1,870 acre research natural area at Sneakfoot Meadows. I believe I have responded not only to all interests, but that the key resources are being recognized. The Elk Summit road leading to and passing through one of the areas will be left open for vehicle traffic and public use.

To meet projected ASQ objectives approximately 22 percent of the 25,288 acres available for development will need to be developed in the first decade.

I am designating the Crab Creek, Savage Ridge, and other areas to Management Area C8S which allows timber harvesting while protecting wildlife by closing all new roads to public vehicles. (See Chapter III of the Forest Plan.)

I am designating some areas of the White Sands Creek breaklands to Management Area E3 because of its potential timber value. This management will protect water quality and fisheries against the unacceptable adverse impacts of road building on these steep slopes

(4) Moose Mountain - Although not highly controversial, there has been a moderate amount of public support for management for wilderness and roadless qualities in this area since the 1970's. RARE I and RARE II both recommended wilderness classification. Because of the relatively small size and nature of the area, its wilderness attributes do not compare to those of the Mallard-Larkins and Hoodoo. But because it is unique and is unsuitable for timber production except along the north side, I believe management without roads for back-country recreation is the best use. Although unscheduled at this time, it is possible some of the 5,193 acres available for development may need to be developed in the first decade to meet the projected ASQ.

(5) Bighorn-Weitas - Cutthroat trout, water quality, elk, and more recently the gray wolf (an endangered species), as well as timber potential, have been the main interests in this area. Most of the area was burned in the early 1900's, resulting in large stand of shrubs and other low vegetation.

Because of the overwhelming public opposition with prior development plans, I have designated Cayuse, Toboggan, and Monroe Creeks to Management Area C6, which will be managed without roads. The Fourth-of-July drainage is also being designated for management without roads primarily to provide maximum protection of big game and other wildlife. I have designated most of the Weitas drainage to Management Area C8S which, I believe, is an excellent compromise for harvesting timber while providing protection for big-game habitat. (See Management Area C8S description and standards in Chapter III of the Forest Plan.)

Although motorized use will be excluded from these areas, I believe in the long run that not only will the timber and big-game resources be managed equally, but a unique setting for recreation will be created. This new C8S Management Area which was developed between the proposed and final Plans was endorsed by the timber industry and the Idaho Department of Fish and Game as well as other publics.

Approximately 17 percent of the total Bighorn-Weitas area available for development will need to be developed in the first decade to meet the projected ASQ.

(6) North Lochsa Slope - The Fish and Hungry Creek drainage portion of this area is key habitat for anadromous fish and is part of a larger area, including the Deadman drainage, that was included in a "unit plan" EIS approved in 1977. The plan at that time received considerable support and except for the upper end of Fish Creek is very similar to my decision at this time. I believe the key resource of anadromous fish habitat, elk winter and summer range, and the undeveloped section of the Lolo Trail System will best be served by Management Area C6 roadless designation. The potential for timber production over most of this area is also very low.

Management Area C8S designation for the upper end of Fish Creek and the Deadman Creek drainage will provide for a moderate amount of timber harvest in areas where potential timber production is higher and will provide for the maintenance of the key elk summer habitat and fish habitat

Management Area A3 designation for the north side of the Lochsa River has received very few public comments. The predominate use has been, and will in all probability continue to be, recreation, mostly hunting. Timber values are low, and I believe this to be the most appropriate management for the present time.

Approximately 31 percent of the 57,162 acres available for development will need to be developed in the first decade to meet the projected ASQ. The area proposed for development will include the Upper Fish Creek area.

(7) Lochsa Face - Much of this area, along with the Elk Summit area, has been the subject of public interest and controversy since the passage of the Wilderness Act in 1964. The administrative decision by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1964 to manage this area for recreation and wildlife will be replaced by the decision in this document. The designation of the down river section of the area to Management Area A3 and the upriver section to Management Area C8S, I believe, recognizes its value for recreation as well as wildlife and timber. I recognize the sensitivity of the area located mostly on stream breaklands draining into the classified Wild and Scenic River Corridor and the Lochsa River. Management standards in the Forest Plan will provide for maintenance of water quality, scenery especially as viewed from the river and Highway 12, and wildlife habitat. Approximately 18 percent of the 50,527 acres available for development will need to be developed during the first decade to meet the projected ASQ.

(8) Rackcliff-Gedney - The Coolwater Ridge area of 4,500 acres is designated for recreation in a semiprimitive setting, because the area is very scenic, has no timber potential, is currently being used for this kind of recreation, and is consistent with management proposed in the adjacent Nez Perce National Forest Plan.

I have designated the remaining portions of all the roadless areas (509,871 acres) to timber management. I made this decision because those areas have potential to provide timber needed now or in the future. Any development that occurs in these areas will comply with Forest Plan management direction, standards and guidelines. Potential adverse impacts to other resources will be prevented or mitigated. (See Chapters II and III in the Forest Plan.)

The total estimated roadless land to be developed within the first decade to meet the projected ASQ is approximately 119,000 acres or 23 percent of the total roadless land which is available for development.

Water Quality Standards/Fisheries Management

Some people thought our water quality standards were too high and put too great a constraint on timber production. They did not believe that our standards needed to be that high to meet the requirements of State and Federal law and regulations. Other respondents thought that the water quality standards were not set high enough to protect water and fisheries from adverse effects and would not meet State or Federal law. Both of these segments of the public were concerned about the accuracy of our data and the computer models which we used to estimate potential impacts of proposed activities on water quality and fish habitat.

One of the highest priorities of management is the maintenance and enhancement of water quality and fisheries habitat. In addition, we are required by the National Forest Management Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Safe Water Drinking Act and State Law to maintain high quality water and not cause any irreversible damage to it.

The Clearwater currently provides relatively high water quality in most of the Forest and excellent habitat for resident fish. Approximately 14 percent or 714 miles of Clearwater National Forest streams have potential to produce anadromous fish. The habitat for anadromous fish has more potential to produce than there are fish returning from the ocean to use it because of the numerous hydro-electric dams on the Columbia, Snake, and Clearwater River. Nevertheless, I am planning to increase the potential of anadromous fisheries habitat and essentially maintain resident fish habitat, such as trout. (See Table 5 which compares present and future potential fisheries habitat.) I believe that problems of anadromous fish returning to the Forest are being resolved, and in the future the potential habitat provided will be fully occupied.

The following table compares current potential fish habitat (1980) with projected potential habitat at the end of the first decade (1997). Current and potential habitat referred to in the table is our projection of the ability of the Forest's fish habitat to produce fish.

Table 5. Potential Fish Habitat

	Current Habitat (m Smolts) (1980)	Projected Habitat (m smolts) (1997)
Chinook	320	367
Steelhead	252	250
Cold Water	524	521

I also believe that maintaining natural runs of anadromous fish is necessary to retain wild gene pools for these species. Artificial hatchery fisheries are prone to disease and other factors which can quickly wipe out entire populations (Chilcole, et al 1986) (Reisenbacher and McIntyre, 1977). The wild gene pools can be used to quickly re-establish or strengthen these artificial runs.

We will continue to use our computer models to help us make decisions, because they have been tested and calibrated. They are basically accurate, and are the best indicators of impacts that we have. We will continue to improve on our methodologies through the monitoring, evaluation and updating.

We also will consider anticipated impacts on water quality from private lands in areas of high fisheries concerns, primarily in the Powell District and Upper North Fork of the Clearwater River where checkerboard ownership patterns exist. Our planned timber or road building proposals will be coordinated with private land activities through State water quality management agencies to ensure meeting basin-wide and Forest water quality standards. In some instances, Forest Service activities may be scaled back or delayed because existing water quality fails to meet the Forest Plan objectives.

Roads: Amount, Construction, Design, and Costs

Reviewers of the Proposed Plan expressed concerns that we were planning to build too many miles of roads to a higher standard and cost than necessary. Reviewers also expressed concerns that roads and their construction have significant adverse effects on soil and water, wildlife, recreation, and scenery.

We will build as few roads as possible to implement Forest Plan objectives. For us to offer the total planned ASQ, it is estimated we will need to construct 69 miles of new road each year during the planning period. If the number of roads are reduced, the ASQ and possibly some other Plan objectives will not be met. Harvesting more volume from the part of the Forest that already has roads is not possible under current laws, regulations, and Plan standards which are designed to protect the other resources of wildlife, water quality, fish, and scenic quality from adverse impacts.

I recognize that roads have adverse impacts on other resources, but as road construction is reduced, adverse impacts to local communities whose economies rely on timber harvesting and processing will increase. I believe 69 miles of new road construction and an ASQ of 173 MMBF will not cause excessive adverse impacts to the other resources and will allow the timber industry and local communities the opportunity to maintain or increase jobs and income associated with timber harvest. (See Chapter IV of the EIS.)

One of my objectives for discussion of the projected impacts is to reduce the road spacing required for timber harvest. The amount of steep terrain designated in the Forest Plan to Management Area E3 for aerial harvest systems (long span cable and helicopter) has tripled to 12,000 acres. This is to minimize erosion potential on steep slopes while still making these areas available for timber management. The use of aerial systems is not economical to apply in many situations but will be used where possible. On other areas, the use of new harvest equipment that requires less road construction will be encouraged.

Roads will be designed and constructed to eliminate or minimize adverse impacts to wildlife, soil and water, fish, scenery, and recreation. Locating the road away from important wildlife habitat, riparian areas, areas of high erosion/mass wasting potential, and scenic areas will be done to reduce impacts.

Road design standards have recently changed and reductions in road costs are anticipated. The C8S Management Area severely restricts public use of new roads which allows them to be designed to a less expensive standard and still support the goals of the management area.

Some roads will be constructed or reconstructed to accommodate recreation, but these will be a small percentage of the total road program.

Road closures and access are discussed under the "Elk Summer Habitat and Road Management" rationale below.

Elk Summer Habitat and Road Management

The Clearwater National Forest contains excellent elk summer range. Most of it was burned early in the century resulting in forbs, grasses and brush fields which provide the elk with ample forage. This area is also, for the most part, roadless which means the elk are

relatively undisturbed by man's activities. Most respondents to the Proposed Forest Plan were concerned that the development of many of these areas for timber would have significant adverse impacts on this habitat.

The Forest Plan requires that elk summer range be managed to achieve a specified level of habitat potential depending on individual management area goals. The following table lists standards for required elk summer habitat potential and expected accomplishment for major management areas which are included in elk summer range.

2

Table 6. Elk Summer Habitat

			Elk Habitat Potential	
Management Area (MA)	MA Emphasis	Acres (rounded)	Required	Expected
To remain unroaded 683,000 acres				
B1	Wilderness	259,000	100	100
B2	Recommended Wilderness	198,000	100	100
C1	Elk Summer Range	45,000	100	100
A3	Semiprimitive Rec.	79,000	100	100
C6	Fishery/Water Quality	102,000	100	100
To be developed 593,100 acres				
C8S	Wildlife/Timber	207,500	75	75+
E1	Timber Production	373,600 *	25	25+
E3	Timber Production/Soil & Water	12,000	25	50

* Excludes 130,000 acres of MA E1 in the Palouse District not managed for elk

(Management Areas listed above are described in the Forest Plan Chapter III)

(Potential elk habitat refers to habitat quality, 100 percent potential means that a site has the optimum amount of habitat factors, including security, to permit elk use at the maximum potential for that site)

The major adverse impact on elk use of summer habitat is open roads. Research has consistently shown that elk will avoid areas adjacent to open roads if the roads are used frequently. Approximately 683,000 acres are planned to remain roadless and will provide near natural levels of elk use (See Chapter IV in the EIS.)

On the remaining 593,100 acres managed for elk on which roads will be eventually constructed, road closures, both seasonal and yearlong, will play a major role in preserving and maintaining elk habitat. On C8S, all new roads are planned to be closed to public use to maintain 75 percent of potential elk habitat. In Management Area E1 many roads will be closed to maintain the minimum 25 percent elk habitat potential. Other benefits of road closures include reduced sediment reaching streams and reduced maintenance and construction costs.

Management Area C8S also requires that logging operations be carried out and planned in such a way that elk which are displaced by those operations can seek refuge in nearby areas.

Currently about 41 percent of the existing Forest roads are closed seasonally or yearlong. The percentage of closed roads will increase significantly in the future to maintain elk habitat (many other wildlife species including the gray wolf also benefit from road closures), reduce erosion, and reduce road construction and maintenance costs. Respondents have objected to road closures because they feel it limits their opportunity to enjoy the Forest, however, the opportunity for motorized recreation will also increase since many new roads will remain open in other areas of the Forest.

I selected this alternative over the others considered, because our analysis indicates there are more than enough recreational opportunities on roads available now and in the future to meet anticipated demands. (See Chapter IV of the EIS and Chapter V of the Forest Plan)

The northern Idaho timber industry and Idaho Fish and Game agreement strongly recommends road closures to benefit wildlife and other resources and endorses the C8S Management Area (*Joint recommendations of Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Idaho Forest Industry Council on the Draft Clearwater National Forest Plan, March 1986*)

This management direction will maintain potential summer habitat at levels above the Forest potential winter habitat.

Elk Winter Range

Respondents to the Proposed Plan, including the Idaho Fish and Game Department, questioned our ability to fund and accomplish the winter range program in the Proposed Forest Plan. That winter range program included a direct habitat improvement program that was ten times higher than any we had accomplished in prior years and relied on high levels of timber harvest in elk winter range.

The Clearwater is somewhat unique among Forests in that it provides most of the winter habitat for its elk. Many other National Forests provide summer range, but the animals migrate off the Forest for the winter. Winter range capacities have been decreasing over the last 20-30 years as the Forest has grown older and the brush fields, which resulted from the massive wildfires in the early part of the 20th Century, have begun to convert to trees. Our analysis has indicated that winter range is the major limiting factor on elk in the Clearwater. (See Chapter II, Table II-24, and Chapter IV of the EIS.)

Currently the Clearwater can support between 13,500 and 17,000 elk in the winter, depending on the severity of the winter. The long-term objective is to consistently provide winter habitat for about 19,900 elk. We think this can be accomplished in the second decade of the Forest Plan. To accomplish this, commercial timber harvest in winter range will be combined with the use of prescribed fire and road closures to achieve the best forage/cover conditions on winter range. Also seasonal road closures will be used to achieve these objectives.

I have scaled back our proposed winter range program in response to the public and internal concern. I have chosen this level of habitat management because it achieves elk objectives by the second decade, and is achievable with anticipated budgets and work force. Alternatives that would achieve our objectives earlier, were not chosen because I think there was a good chance that they could not be accomplished.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Forest Service policy and public comments received on the Proposed Forest Plan and DEIS led to the examination of Forest rivers and streams. The National Park Service included the North Fork of the Clearwater River and Kelly Creek in the Clearwater National Forest in its Nationwide River Inventory (NRI) of 1981. In 1982, the Chief of the Forest Service directed that Forest Plans should at least address eligibility for Wild and Scenic Rivers of those Forest streams which were listed on the NRI. Further agency direction requires that streams other than those inventoried should also be assessed for eligibility. Streams that are identified as eligible must be protected until suitability studies can be completed.

I have complied with this direction in the Forest Plan. The North Fork of the Clearwater River is deemed eligible because of its outstanding recreational and scenic values. Kelly Creek and Cayuse Creek are deemed eligible because of their outstanding cutthroat trout fishery.

These three Wild and Scenic River candidates fall within Management Areas A4 (visual management corridors) and M2 (riparian areas). (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Forest Plan for descriptions of these management areas.) The management direction for these areas will provide limited protection for these streams until suitability studies can be completed. For further protection, additional standards and guidelines have been developed and can be found in Chapter II of the Forest Plan

Management of the Visual Resource

Public comments encouraged more emphasis on "visual resource management" to maintain scenic beauty. Some of those who commented discouraged activities such as timber cutting and road building, which detract from scenic beauty. Others asked if we had identified the timber volume trade-off between timber harvesting and the visual resource.

Natural appearing landscapes, vegetation, streams, lakes, and mountain-top vistas provide *attractive scenic diversity which will be maintained*. Standards will ensure that management activities meeting other resource needs will maintain the visual resource.

The following table displays the visual quality objectives for maintaining the scenery. They are designated on lands suitable for timber harvest.

Table 7. Visual Quality Objectives

Visual Quality Objectives	Acres
Retention	36,000
Partial Retention	146,000
Modification	695,000
Maximum Modification	111,000

In addition, existing and recommended wilderness will be managed for the visual quality objective of Preservation (457,000 acres), and areas which will be managed without roads (242,000 acres) will be managed for the visual quality objective of Retention. (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Forest Plan.) Visually sensitive areas such as certain road corridors, streams, fire lookouts and other recreational attractions are assigned to Management Area A4. This designation will ensure that harvest activities and road building do not dominate surrounding Forest landscape.

Application of these standards on suitable areas causes a reduction of present net value of 4 percent and a reduction in long-term sustained yield of timber harvest of 1 percent. I believe these are acceptable trade-offs to maintain visual quality.

Cultural and Historical Resources

Responses to the Proposed Forest Plan were concerned that we were meeting the intent of laws and regulations designed to protect historical and cultural resources and Indian Tribes' religious sites. In response, I have strengthened overall standards to require identification of existing resources and opportunities for additional protection. I have also added direction to look at opportunities to prevent degradation of cultural sites based on Forest priorities. (See Forestwide Management Direction in Chapter II of the Forest Plan.)

Resource management direction in Management Area A6 is strengthened to emphasize interpretation of historical resources for the appreciation and understanding of Forest users. The Lolo Trail Implementation Guidelines are improved by adding a section that addresses objectives and methods of management along the trail, based on vegetation which is present. Lastly, that portion of the Hungry Creek drainage that contains the only undeveloped section of the Lewis and Clark Trail in the Nation has been protected from road building and timber development for the planning period by designating it to Management Area C6. (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Plan.)

Energy Corridor

In a late response to the Proposed Forest Plan and DEIS, the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) informed the Forest that we had failed to meet legal responsibilities to address and evaluate the proposed R-26, major east-west utility corridor. The R-26 corridor was identified in the BPA/Forest Service Long Range East-West Corridor Study of 1977. National Forest Planning regulation 36 CFR 219.7 requires Forest Plans to be coordinated with plans of other Federal Agencies. The 1983 Northern Regional Guide identified the R-26 corridor and directed Forests to "evaluate through the Forest Plan potential effect of management direction on identified potential corridors..."

While the Proposed Forest Plan failed to address this potential corridor specifically, it did include direction for each management area. Standards classify each management area as utility corridor exclusion areas (like recommended wilderness where corridors cannot be located), avoidance areas like the Lewis and Clark Trail where corridors are not desirable, or suitable areas where corridors are permitted with appropriate mitigation). (See Management Area Direction in Chapter III of the Plan.) Therefore, potential utility corridor development along the identified "window" is possible (not excluded) but not desirable, because in some cases avoidance areas must be crossed. (Also see Chapter IV of the EIS.)

My identification of the corridor in the Forest Plan does not constitute an endorsement of this corridor by the Forest Service. It only acknowledges that development might be possible after study.

BPA is not currently proposing to develop this corridor during the life of this Plan. This corridor is one of four potential east-west corridors. Future energy demands and Regional studies will determine when and if the corridors need to be developed to provide energy for the Nation.

Research Natural Areas (RNA) and Special Areas

I believe I have met the Regional RNA targets assigned to the Clearwater National Forest, except for a hot springs area. Following are my reasons for identifying each RNA.

Aquarius: This 3,900-acre unit which will encompass both sides of the North Fork of the Clearwater River below Aquarius bridge, is the largest of any RNA being proposed in the Forest. Because the area includes representative habitat timber types as well as a relatively isolated section of disjunct West Coast species, I believe the area is a valuable addition to the RNA system.

Because of concerns with future access to the Dworshak Reservoir and possible water transportation of logs from the North Fork country, I have made provision for a potential

access road along the north side of the river between Isabella Creek and the reservoir. An area adjacent to Isabella Creek and the old log landing has also been deleted to provide space for a proposed campground.

Four-Bit: This 330 acre RNA was added primarily to maintain a remnant of undisturbed land in the heart of the western red cedar/western white pine timber types.

Bald Mountain: Although this area has been enlarged to include some lodgepole pine types, the primary purpose is to protect the rough fescue for future study. This is a valuable forage species that exists in very limited quantities in northern Idaho.

Bull Run: This area represents a typical timber type located on basalt which is not found in most of the Forest. Although being considered for land exchange, a potential road right-of-way is being allowed to provide access to private land south of the proposed RNA.

Chateau Falls: The primary purposes of including this area in the RNA system is to maintain for study aquatic vegetation that would be influenced by the waterfalls.

Dutch Creek: Paper birch, a long-term seral species, occupies much of the burned area along the Lochsa River. This area located within the Lochsa Recreation River Corridor, will provide an opportunity to study the effects of a catastrophic fire, long-term productivity, and vegetative composition.

Sneakfoot Meadows: This rather large area of 1,870 acres encompasses a small drainage in the Elk Summit area that consists primarily of wet meadows and the associated vegetation. This area and its vegetation are fragile and sensitive to change. In addition, moose use is significant, affording an opportunity to study the relationships between vegetation and wildlife.

Steep Lake: Two lakes, one supporting a small population of California golden trout and the other barren, as well as the surrounding aquatic vegetation, will be maintained in the recommended Hoodoo Wilderness. The area is high country, very sensitive to change and will provide opportunity to study the future of a unique fishery as well as high country aquatic vegetation.

Threatened and Endangered Species Management

Essential recovery habitat has been identified for the gray wolf in the Clearwater Forest. Bald Eagles use the larger rivers and streams in the winter. It is not known for sure whether grizzly bears occupy the Clearwater at this time but the Forest is conducting studies to determine if recovery habitat is present.

Some public comments opposed managing for the gray wolf and the grizzly bear. Reasons given for opposition were that managing for these species reduces options for potential timber production and that these animals are dangerous to Forest users and livestock.

I am committed to providing essential habitat for the recovery of threatened and endangered species. The Endangered Species Act of 1973 requires that all Federal agencies should seek to conserve threatened and endangered species. Public land, such as the National Forests, may be the only place in this area where it is possible to provide habitat for threatened and endangered species.

The management of gray wolf habitat will not have significant effects on management of other resources. Management direction in the Forest Plan aimed at providing elk habitat adequately provides for the gray wolf because it provides security and an adequate prey base. This management will affect motorized use by the public and timber harvest scheduling to some extent.

Bald eagles using the Clearwater will be adequately protected because of the riparian area and wild and scenic river management area direction.

Once studies are completed on potential grizzly bear habitat in the Clearwater, management implications, if any, will be analyzed at that time. A Forest Plan amendment or revision may be necessary if changes in management are required.

Minerals

Although minerals was not a major issue of the Clearwater National Forest, I have chosen to highlight it in the Record of Decision. I believe maintaining the existing rights for prospecting, developing and mining resources is important to our National well being. There is a potential for the development of nonenergy mineral resources.

When setting standards for mineral development, there is a need to protect other resources while providing for the prospecting and exploration of minerals. Recognizing this, my decision on leasable minerals is to require special access restriction on 862,432 acres and allow standard operating conditions on 515,592 acres. Additionally, 459,117 acres have been withdrawn from mineral entry. Resource management standards in the Forest Plan will be included in the Plans of Operation for activities relating to the development and extracting of mineral resources. I have also provided standards to guide oil and gas leasing recommendations, however, it appears that the potential for any activity related to these resources is low.

B. Compatibility with the Goals of Other Public Agencies and Indian Tribes

During the planning process, agencies, organizations, Indian Tribes, and individuals were consulted. Other agency plans were reviewed and used in developing the Forest Plan. Appendix A of the EIS lists the agencies, plans, interest groups, and organizations that were consulted through the process. It is important that these other plans are considered so that the Clearwater Plan is not unnecessarily duplicative or conflicting. Working together with the agencies, Indian Tribes, and other organizations, we may be able to achieve mutual objectives more effectively.

The following is a summary of major activities that has been coordinated with the plans of others.

In the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's official biological opinion, dated July 22, 1987 the Forest Plan meets Federal laws and regulations and is in compliance with Federal recovery plans for all endangered and threatened species including the gray wolf, bald eagle, and grizzly bear.

The identification of potential candidate research natural areas (RNA's) is compatible with the goals of The Nature Conservancy, Idaho Natural Areas Coordinating Committee, and Forest Service Intermountain Station Research Unit. The Clearwater National Forest will

continue to cooperate with these organizations in the identification and evaluation of potential RNA's and identification and location of endangered and threatened plant and animal species and other species of special concern in Idaho.

Location and management of the Lolo National Historic Trail System is generally compatible with objectives of the National Park Service, Nez Perce National Park, Governor's Lewis and Clark Trail Committee, and the Nez Perce Tribe.

Two river corridors, the North Fork of the Clearwater River and Kelly Creek, within the Clearwater National Forest were inventoried by the National Park Service as potential rivers for the National Wild and Scenic River System. These streams along with Cayuse Creek will be protected from adverse affects to their character until further study is completed.

Management and protection of wildlife and fish habitat is compatible with the Idaho Fish and Game Species Management Plans

Management of lands in the upper reaches of the Dworshak Reservoir is compatible with plans of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Forest Plan direction has acknowledged U.S. Department of Energy, Bonneville Power Administration plans for major east-west energy corridors.

Forest Plan direction is compatible with local County Economic Development Association plans to develop and utilize natural resources for the benefit of local economics and life styles.

Our plans to enhance water quality and fisheries habitats are compatible with objectives of Columbia River Basin Native American tribes and the Northwest Power Planning Council to improve Columbia River Basin anadromous fish runs.

Direction to identify, preserve, and interpret cultural and historical areas is compatible with objectives of the State Historic Preservation Council and area Indian Tribes

Plan direction is somewhat compatible with plans of the Idaho Department of Highways for the management of the Highway 12 scenic corridor. The Idaho Department of Highways is concerned with providing safe and efficient travel on U S. Highway 12 The Forest Service is concerned with protecting the scenic quality and fisheries habitat of the Congressionally designated Recreation River corridor. The goals of each agency are not always complementary, and they sometimes conflict We will cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the Department of Highways to meet both objectives.

Forest Plan direction emphasizes integrated pest management techniques to control noxious weeds and is generally compatible with local County weed commissioner's plans for noxious weed control

C. Economic Efficiency

In determining the most economically efficient alternative, the Forest Service uses an estimate of present net value, which is the difference between discounted benefits and discounted costs In calculating present net value, a dollar value is assigned to various outputs Some of these output values are market-determined, such as timber, and produce a revenue. Other resource outputs use assigned values derived from research studies, such

as recreation. However, present net value does not include a value for some resources that neither produce revenue nor have a basis from which to estimate a value as in the case of fish and water quality. Therefore, present net value cannot be the only criteria used in selecting the Selected Alternative. The criterion used was the maximization of net public benefit which includes both the net value of the priced outputs and the consideration of the nonpriced outputs.

Related to the issue of economic efficiency is the controversy over below-cost sales which have become a National concern. In the past three years, overall timber related costs have not been recovered by Forestwide timber sale receipts. This has been a management concern and emphasis is being placed on reducing timber management and related costs. Regional direction requires additional project level analysis of each timber sale over 1 MMBF to assure that the sale has been designed with the most cost-effective measures possible in keeping with environmental concerns. Therefore, "below cost" sales that may occur are the least cost method of accomplishing the Forest Plan goals and objectives.

Timber harvesting can produce benefits other than direct cash receipts such as improving wildlife habitat (big-game winter range) and visual quality, increasing livestock forage, reducing fire protection costs, managing insects and disease in Forest stands, and providing plant diversity.

In making my decision, I thought it was necessary to evaluate how opportunities would change by selecting alternatives with varying combinations of present net value and non-priced outputs. This helped me to understand the interactions occurring between resources in determining net public benefit. Table 8 displays each alternative along with the estimate of present net value arranged in order of decreasing present net value. In addition, Table 8 shows estimated outputs for selected priced and nonpriced resources which relate to the key issues used in selecting the Forest Plan.

The following discussion presents the differences among the alternatives that have a higher present net value than the Selected Alternative K.

Alternative E1

Alternative E1 has the highest present net value of all the alternatives, about \$60 million less than the Maximum Present Net Value Benchmark. This alternative is identical to Alternative E, which was the Preferred Alternative in the draft EIS, except the timber harvest level is allowed to decline in future decades. For this alternative, the timber harvest is low in the first decade and significantly higher in the fourth, fifth, and sixth decades. This departure in the base sale schedule, in the later decades, explains the significantly higher present net value for this alternative than for Alternative K and the other alternatives.

The reduction in present net value from the Maximum Present Net Value Benchmark is a result of increasing fisheries habitat requirements to high fishable for all roadless areas and minimum viable for roaded areas (except for low fishable in Pierce District, no constraints in Palouse District, high fishable on the roaded portions of the North Fork and Powell Districts, and moderate fishable in the roaded portion of the Lochsa District) and a reduction of 240,000 acres suitable for timber harvest.

Alternative C

Alternative C has the second highest present net value among the alternatives, \$81 million

less than the Maximum Present Net Value Benchmark. In this alternative, present net value is reduced by excluding timber harvest on 116,200 acres that have been designated for recommended wilderness or management without roads, by meeting moderate water quality and fishery objectives, building roads on not more than 15 percent of suitable roadless lands, excluding C2 Management Areas, and reducing the suitable acres available for timber harvest by 114,000 acres. Correspondingly, it has the second highest level of timber harvest. The result of emphasizing the market resources is a lower level of nonmarket and nonpriced outputs. Overall potential anadromous fish potential is lower than in Alternative K.

Alternative B

Alternative B has the third highest present net value, \$89 million less than the Maximum Present Net Value Benchmark. This reduction in present net value is primarily due to low water quality and fishery objectives, constraining access to not more than 15 percent of the suitable roadless areas, and constraining the application of the C2 Management Area prescription. The result is the highest level of timber production of all the alternatives. The levels of anadromous fish habitat, elk winter range capacity, and improvement of wildlife habitat in Alternative B are low compared to other alternatives. Alternative K has a lower present net value and timber harvest level than Alternative B but, I believe that Alternative K better resolves the public issues of anadromous fish habitat, elk winter range and wildlife habitat, and is closer to maximizing net public benefits.

Alternative G

Alternative G has the fourth highest present net value; \$192 million less than the Maximum Present Net Value Benchmark. The reduction in present net value is primarily due to excluding timber harvest from 454,000 acres that have been designated for recommended wilderness, applying the A4 and A6 Management Areas on suitable timber lands, constraining access to suitable roadless land to not more than 15 percent in decade one, designating low water quality and fishery objectives, and excluding the C2 Management Areas. The result is more intensive management on the remaining timberland. The timber harvest in the first decade is the third highest of all alternatives. I believe that Alternative G does not maximize net public benefits because of the level of potential anadromous fish habitat when compared to Alternative K.

Table 8. Comparison of Alternatives

ALTN	PNV MM \$	Tbr Vol MMBF Dec 1	Road Const Miles Dec 1	Wilder- ness MRVD's Dec 5	Anadrom Steel- head M Smolt Dec 5	Anadrom Chinook M Smolt Dec 5	Resident Catchable Trout M Fish Dec 5	Elk M Elk Dec 3	Comm Impact Jobs Dec 1
Max PNV	1320 1	297	119	105 5	139 7	171 0	319 6	35 0	5014
E1	1260 5	146	61	182 4	204 0	242 6	535 6	24 6	2979
C	1239 1	213	64	124 0	222 1	340 2	489 9	34 3	3770
B	1231 5	225	69	105 5	137 0	188 7	508 6	34 5	3923
G	1127 8	191	61	290 3	222 2	340 7	468 7	29 5	3514
K (s a)	1124 5	173	69	183 7	238 2	353 0	494 6	29 2	3395
J	1095 4	176	62	210 6	243 0	361 7	533 9	27 7	3340
A (c d)	1093 8	181	62	183 0	205 5	340 2	509 7	29 6	3383
D	1089 2	176	62	158 6	243 0	361 7	535 4	27 7	3340
E	1053 7	160	62	182 4	249 0	337 3	535 4	26 9	3132
F	1007 1	160	61	226 4	242 2	342 1	533 9	22 1	3132
H	898 4	139	43	396 7	227 5	361 7	534 1	21 8	2897
I	735 5	117	29	492 3	243 4	360 8	534 8	16 9	2638

D. Social and Economic Stability

I considered the social and economic consequences of the various alternatives in arriving at my decision. An analysis of these consequences was made by the Forest and is displayed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

From a social perspective, I think Alternative K is the most desirable. It makes available for sale the timber volume important for community stability. At the same time, it maintains the amenities important to Indian Tribes and other local residents, as well as visitors. I believe the Forest Plan provides for the continuation of lifestyles that are dependent upon existing use and management of the Forest. Consideration of these factors was an important part of my decision to balance the needs for jobs and economic stability with environmental values. I believe the Forest Plan provides this balance.

In 1980, the Clearwater National Forest provided about 11 percent of the total income and 10 percent of the total jobs in the Forest's area of influence. No major shifts in total populations, jobs or incomes are expected as a result of the Forest Plan.

E. Environmental Quality

I considered the environmental consequences of the various alternatives, and environmental quality was a significant consideration in my selection of Alternative K. Air quality will be maintained within legal limits, and water quality will meet or exceed present State standards during the life of the Forest Plan. Soil erosion will be minimized and long-term soil productivity will be maintained. Fish and wildlife habitat will be maintained. Timber harvest, road construction, and mineral activities will be designed to minimize adverse effects on wildlife. Forest management will improve the health, vigor, and diversity of the Forest and will reduce the risk of insect and disease epidemics and catastrophic wildfires.

The management standards developed to protect environmental quality are displayed in Chapters II and III of the Forest Plan. These standards provide the specific direction and mitigating measures to assure that long-term productivity is not impaired by the application of short-term management practices.

The environmental consequences of the various alternatives are discussed in Chapter IV of the EIS. Environmental consequences will be monitored to ensure compliance with the Forest Plan and with applicable laws and regulations.

Adverse effects which cannot be avoided are identified by resource activity in Chapter IV of the EIS. The application of Forestwide standards is intended to limit the number and duration of adverse effects. However, the following adverse effects are associated to some extent with all alternatives:

Potential increases in sediment resulting from soil disturbance and a minor increase in water yield associated with timber harvest activities.

Short-term reduced air quality from dust, smoke, and automobile emissions resulting from recreation in addition to timber, wildlife and range management activities.

F. Summary of Reasons for Selecting the Forest Plan

As described in the preceding pages, I believe the Forest Plan provides a management

strategy for the Forest that maximizes net public benefit. This is achieved by balancing among commodity outputs (such as timber and minerals) and amenity values (such as wildlife and fish, scenic quality, and diverse recreational opportunities) that are important to area residents and Forest users. Management is within the physical and biological capability of the land.

I am confident the Forest Plan meets the demands we predict will be made on the Forest resources for the next ten to fifteen years. Many divergent opinions were considered in the development and selection of the Forest Plan. It was not possible to meet all requests and desires, however, I believe the Plan achieves a proper balance between commodity and amenity values considering the range and intensity of concerns expressed by the public on the various issues.

I made the decision to adopt Alternative K as the Forest Plan in light of the Forest Service mission as defined by the legislative mandate of the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, and the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resource Planning Act of 1974, as amended by the National Forest Management Act of 1976. The Forest Plan, to the best of my knowledge, complies with the legal requirements and policies applicable to the Clearwater National Forest.

Analysis of public comments on the draft EIS produced additional information that prompted me to make adjustments in Alternative E which was the Preferred Alternative displayed in the draft EIS. These adjustments led to the development of the Selected Alternative K. I considered the significance of the adjustments made and find that no significant new information has been added or substantial changes made. I conclude that the magnitude of change from Alternative E to Alternative K was within the range of alternatives discussed and the environmental effects disclosed in the draft EIS, and therefore, that no supplement to the draft EIS is needed. A complete discussion of Alternative K is represented in the EIS.

VIII ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Alternatives were developed by the Forest to display land management options, to provide analytical data for comparisons, and to determine the relative effects of various ways of addressing the issues. All alternatives that were addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) are briefly described below. More detailed information on alternatives and their development can be found in Chapter II and in Appendix B of the EIS.

1. Alternative A (Current Direction) - Alternative A is the "current direction" alternative. It was not designed to respond to newly identified issues, concerns, or opportunities. Besides the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness, four areas are recommended for wilderness; these are the same areas proposed for wilderness in RARE II. The number of elk increases by more than 6,000. The water quality/fishery objectives are moderate fishable to low across most of the Forest. Timber offered for sale remains at 181 MMBF in the first decade.

2. Alternative B - The goal of Alternative B is to produce the maximum amount of market outputs (timber and range forage). No additional areas are recommended for wilderness. No roadless areas are left undeveloped over time. Opportunities for recreation change in later years from a mix of roaded natural and primitive experiences to all roaded natural. Elk population increases in the early decades but decreases to 10,200 elk over time as the animals lose their hiding cover and security on summer range. Water quality is lowered, but not below the level that provides potential low fisheries over most of the Forest. The timber harvest level is 225 MMBF/per year in decade one.

3. Alternative C - Alternative C produces a high level of market outputs (timber and range forage) while providing moderate fish habitat and elk habitat. The recommended new wilderness corresponds to that proposed by the timber industry in Idaho, and an additional 70,685 acres remain undeveloped. Elk populations increase then decrease, as in Alternative B. Fish populations are maintained at moderate to low levels. About 213 MMBF of timber is harvested annually in the first decade.

4. Alternative D - Alternative D is designed to provide a mix of market and nonmarket outputs with emphasis on market goods from lands suitable for that purpose. This alternative represents the wilderness proposed by the Idaho Congressional delegation in 1984. In addition to the wilderness, 293,237 acres remain undeveloped. Elk population increases to a minimum of 18,700 elk throughout the planning horizon (150 years). As stream sediment increases, fish habitat is disturbed, but populations remain above high potential habitat level in most of the Forest. During the first decade, 176 MMBF of timber is harvested annually.

5. Alternative E - This alternative provides a mix of market and non-market outputs with emphasis on timber production, fishery and elk habitat. It is designed to answer most major issues, concerns and opportunities in the draft documents. A total of 188,871 additional acres is recommended for wilderness. In addition, approximately 188,000 acres that have generated a lot of public interest remain roadless. A minimum of 18,700 elk is supported throughout the planning horizon (150 years). A pristine level of fisheries is maintained in all undeveloped lands, and the portions of North Fork, Lochsa, and Powell Districts that have roads are maintained at a high level. The population of anadromous fish increases over time and is higher than present because of restrictive management activities and direct habitat improvement. Timber harvest is 160 MMBF per year in decade one.

6. Alternative E1 - This allows timber harvest levels to fluctuate up or down. Timber harvest declines to 146 MMBF/year in decade one but increases to 303 MMBF/year by decade three. All other objectives are the same as Alternative E.

7. Alternative F - The goal of Alternative F is to provide protection to the Kelly Creek-Cayuse Creek and Fish Creek watersheds and to recommend wilderness in five areas while managing intensively other areas suitable for timber production to provide a moderate level of timber production. Elk population increases to a minimum of 20,900 animals throughout the planning period. A high level of fish production is maintained except in the Palouse District and the portion of Pierce District that contains roads. Timber sales in the first decade is less than at present, with 160 MMBF being harvested annually.

8. Alternative G - This alternative has a substantial wilderness proposal while emphasizing market outputs from lands already developed for that purpose and from selected roadless lands especially suited for timber production. Alternative G depicts the Idaho Wilderness Coalition's proposal for wilderness. Elk population increases in the second decade but then declines by the fifteenth decade. Anadromous smolts decline below current levels by the fifth decade. Intensive development on lands outside the wilderness lowers the number of resident fish. A total sale program of 191 MMBF of timber is offered annually in the first decade.

9. Alternative H - Alternative H provides high levels of nonmarket goods from the undeveloped portion of the Forest by designating currently roadless areas to uses that restrict or prohibit access by roads. Market goods are produced from areas previously developed

but at levels determined by the effect on other resource values. A total of 715,523 acres is recommended for wilderness. A moderate elk population is supported throughout the planning horizon as winter range becomes limiting. The water quality/fishery objective is high fishable across most of the Forest. Anadromous smolt and resident fisheries increase. A total sale program of 139 MMBF of timber is offered annually in the first decade.

10. Alternative I - This alternative recommends all roadless areas to wilderness. It continues market outputs at moderate levels from lands already developed. Opportunities for recreation in a wilderness setting exceed the predicted demand for the entire planning horizon. Elk population increases in the second and third decades and then decreases. The water quality/fishery objective is high fishable across most of the Forest. Anadromous smolts are at very high levels, habitat conditions on the developed portions of the Forest gradually improve over time. Approximately 117 MMBF of timber is offered for sale annually during the first decade.

11. Alternative J - Alternative J is similar to Alternative D in outputs and effects but differs in the amount of roadless area recommended for wilderness and available for timber production. This wilderness proposal is the same as that of the local elected officials. Alternative J addresses timber production, elk, special areas, water quality, minerals, the quality of fish habitat, and roadless recreation issues. Elk are provided at high levels over time. Water quality is high. A total sale program of 176 MMBF of timber is produced annually in the first decade.

12. Alternative K (Selected Alternative) - Alternative K is the Selected Alternative and is a modification of Alternatives E, but includes parts of Alternatives F and J. This alternative also provides a mix of market and nonmarket outputs. Recommended wilderness is increased by 198,200 acres, and a total of 242,240 acres will be managed without roads. Water quality is essentially the same as Alternative E, with high levels of fish production. Elk numbers drop in the first decade from those projected in Alternative E, but increase to higher levels over time because of winter range improvements. Timber sale quantity in the first decade is permitted to raise to 173.3 MMBF. Forest Plan objectives and standards have been strengthened to protect historical and cultural resources and require the use of integrated pest management methods. Visual resource objectives based on a Forestwide inventory are included. Three candidates for Wild and Scenic River designation are identified and protected. Recommendations for research natural areas are expanded.

Major changes from Alternative E include

- An increase in recommended wilderness. Alternative K recommends 9,300 acres more for wilderness classification.
- An increase in areas managed without roads. Alternative K has 53,800 more acres in these management areas.
- The addition of a silvicultural prescription and Management Area C8S to protect key elk summer habitat.
- An increase in the ASQ from 160 MMBF to 173 MMBF.

IX. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED

Two proposed alternatives were received from the public during the comment period, one

from Potlatch Corporation and one from the Wilderness Society. After evaluation, I decided not to display them as additional alternatives. The primary reason for not including them was that the outputs and effects were within the range of alternatives as displayed in the draft and final EIS's. Additional reasons are discussed in Chapter II of the EIS

X. COMPARISON OF THE ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE AND THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE

Alternative I was determined to be the Environmentally Preferred Alternative. Implementation of this alternative would cause less physical and biological disturbance than any other alternative because fewer acres would be disturbed by timber harvesting and fewer roads would be required in the planning period (1988-1997) than in other alternatives. All 950,311 acres of inventoried roadless area would continue to be managed without additional roads or development. In the developed portion of the Forest, objectives would assure full protection of water quality, fish, and wildlife. Timber harvesting and road construction would occur in this alternative; however, having some negative impacts on these resources.

The Environmentally Preferred Alternative differs from the Selected Alternative K in several respects:

Roadless

Alternative I would maintain all of the current roadless inventory, as undeveloped. The Selected Alternative K will maintain 440,440 acres or 46 percent as wilderness or roadless. Alternative I is environmentally superior to the Forest Plan.

Timber

Alternative I would harvest 4,900 acres per year during the planning period for an annual sale quantity of 117 MMBF. The Selected Alternative will harvest approximately 11,200 acres annually for an annual volume of 173 MMBF during the planning period (1988-1997). The fewer harvest acres in Alternative I would reduce the potential for negative impacts on other resources.

Water Quality and Fisheries

Water quality and fish objectives in Alternative I are similar to those in the Forest Plan. As a result, fish habitat is approximately the same for both Alternatives I and K for anadromous fisheries. For resident fish, habitat is lower in Alternative K because more roads will be constructed into roadless areas for timber harvest, and the risks of adversely affect water quality and fish in those watersheds are greater. Alternative I would have an environmental advantage over the Forest Plan.

Wildlife

Additional acres of wilderness in Alternative I would provide more undisturbed, secure habitats for many wildlife species than will be available in the Forest Plan. However, the species that benefit from younger Forests, such as elk and deer, would be affected as these areas grow older. The Forest Plan provides for greater ability to manage elk habitat than Alternative I.

Soils

Fewer activities that disturb soils, such as timber harvesting and road construction would occur in Alternative I than in the Forest Plan. As a result, the potential for adverse impacts such as compaction, would be less than in the Forest Plan.

Economic Efficiency

Alternative I has a present net value of \$736 million. Alternative K has a higher present net value of \$1125 million and therefore is a more efficient alternative.

Economic Impact

Alternative I results in a decrease of 400 jobs over the planning period. In contrast, the Selected Alternative K provides for an increase of 357 jobs during the planning period thus making a positive contribution to community stability.

Insect and Disease

Because none of the roadless lands would be developed in Alternative I, large areas of mature and over-mature timber would exist eventually. The potential for insect and disease attack would be greater in these acres than in Alternative K where many of these stands would be harvested. As these stands are harvested and extensive, uniform age classes are interspersed with younger stands, the potential for insect and disease attack will be reduced.

Conclusion

Even though Alternative I is preferable from the standpoint of the physical and biological environment, I believe Alternative K provides for a better mix of management emphases and maximizes the net public benefit while protecting the environment. Some components of the environment will be managed at similar levels in both alternatives, such as water quality and fish. Also, increased management emphasis on programs such as big-game habitat improvement in Alternative K will result in higher resource outputs than Alternative I.

XI. IMPLEMENTATION AND MITIGATION

Implementation

Implementation of the Forest Plan will begin 30 days after the Notice of Availability of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision appear in the *Federal Register* (36 CFR 219.10 [c] [1]).

Implementation requires moving from an existing land-use management program with a budget and schedule of activities, to the level of management outlined in the Forest Plan. In areas where management activities have already occurred, some period of adjustment may be required to attain Forest Plan goals and objectives. However, as soon as practicable the Forest Supervisor will ensure that, subject to valid existing rights, all projects and contractual obligations are consistent with the Forest Plan. The schedule listing individual timber sales is not a decision in the Forest Plan on these sales. It provides public information as required by Forest Service Manual 1922.5. This schedule is subject to updates based upon budget, market or other considerations.

The Forest Supervisor has authority to change the implementation schedule to reflect differences between proposed annual budgets and actual appropriated funds. Such scheduled changes are considered an amendment to the Forest Plan, but are not considered a significant amendment or require the preparation of an EIS, unless the changes significantly alter the long-term relationships between levels of multiple-use goods and services projected under planned budget proposals as compared to those projected under actual appropriations (36 CFR 219.10 [e]). The public will be notified, at least annually, of changes to this implementation schedule.

If, during Forest Plan implementation, it is determined that the best way to achieve the prescription for a management area does not totally conform to a management prescription standard, the Forest Supervisor may amend that standard for a specific project. Such site specific amendments (CFR 219.10 [f]) and the rationale for the changes must conform to the National Environmental Policy Act and the Threatened and Endangered Species Act and other statutory requirements.

Budgets

Most outputs will be affected by the budget. The Plan specifies the total budget and mix of funding items necessary to produce the proposed outputs. Changes to the budget in any given year, may require projects scheduled for that year to be rescheduled. If the budget is significantly different from the Plan over a period of several years so that Forest Plan objectives cannot be met, the Plan itself may have to be amended.

Mitigation

Mitigation measures are an integral part of the Forest Plan. Implementation is guided by the goals and objectives and Forestwide management standards located in Chapter II of the Forest Plan, and by the specific management area prescriptions and requirements addressed in Chapter III of the Forest Plan. The management standards were developed through an interdisciplinary effort and contain measures necessary to mitigate or eliminate any long-term adverse environmental effects. Additional mitigation measures and management standards are discussed in the various appendices to the Forest Plan. The disclosure of effects described in Chapter IV of the EIS is premised on the assumption the implementing any alternative will include the mitigation of effects by employing selected mitigation measures. To the best of my knowledge, all practical mitigation measures have been adopted and are included in the Forest Plan.

XII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The management control system for the Forest Plan includes monitoring and evaluation. It will provide you and me with information on the progress and results of implementation. This information and evaluation will provide feedback into the Forest planning process for possible future change.

Table IV-1 in the Forest Plan displays the basic outline of the monitoring process. An annual monitoring program, developed in accordance with this outline, will be prepared as part of the Clearwater National Forest annual program of work. Detailed programs will be prepared for all resources and activities requiring monitoring. These programs will be based on funds available. If funds are inadequate to monitor the Forest Plan goals and objectives properly, an analysis will be made to develop a further course of action. This may include Forest Plan amendment or revision, or dropping of projects.

The results and trends of monitoring described in the annual monitoring report will be evaluated and summarized annually. An evaluation report will be prepared at least every five years

Data acquired by monitoring will be used to update inventories, to improve further mitigation measures, and to assess the need for amending or revising the Forest Plan.

XIII. PLANNING RECORDS

Planning records contain the detailed information and decisions used in developing the Forest Plan and EIS as required in 36 CFR 219.12.

All of the documentation chronicling the Forest planning process is available for inspection during regular business hours at:

Forest Supervisor's Office
Clearwater National Forest
12730 Highway 12
Orofino, ID 83544

These records are incorporated by reference into the EIS and Forest Plan.

XIV. RIGHT TO APPEAL

My decision, except for my recommendation for wilderness designation, is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 211.18. Notice of appeal must be in writing and submitted to me:

James C. Overbay, Regional Forester
Northern Region
USDA Forest Service
P O Box 7669
Missoula, MT 59807

Appeal notice must be submitted within 45 days from the date of this decision. A statement of reasons to support the appeal and any request for oral presentation must be filed within the 45 day period for filing a notice of appeal.


JAMES C. OVERBAY
Regional Forester

SEP 23 1987
Date